8/23/71

Dear Jim,

In today's mail: Sputnik, Benton letter, sheaf of questions to Ray, Order in CA3651-70, LA Star.

Benton: suggest writing letter saying his had been forwarded to lawyers asking description man he saw and all other details. Probably nothing, but why not find out?

First mention of money: if Ray is not wrong, how explain that 60%?

Getting Foreman as lawyer: he evades direct answer, but Jerry told me it was his idea, in consultation with John. He also told me he had not asked James. I do not think JER intended edeliberate evasion.

He is correct on John first suggesting Foreman and I have the Chicago story. They did use JER's reply.

If it is true that British never told him he was entitled to counsel o his choice: was he there? Is there a legal point here, regardless of its present meaningfulness? This can be important to me in another context.

Selecting Hanes: not completely forthright. He knew of other famous lawyers. He also knew the kind of cases Hanes had taken. If, as he did, he approached Hanes and Bailey through British counsel, he did not need thier addresses. And while it is not innacurate to say that Bailey said he had a conflict, what I think he really said is that he had been a friend of K.

3/9 question, "as precisely as possible", has shortest, imprecise answers. What Bud added is quite consistent with what Foreman later said, the This response comes from FRAME-UP.

Question, Huie in London (Battle said he was but he wasn't). But if Hanes, who had a deal with Huie before he went to England the first time, didn't even mention it and the complications it meant by the second time, before the extradition and the recommendation not to appeal it, is there not a legal point here. I pushed Hanes gently on this henwe confronted, I have tapes of it, and he was edgy on it.

Please tell Bill that Jerry is to send him xeroxes of most of the NY Times stuff we discussed. After he reads it I'll see if there is anything significant he did not send. Bill said we'd talk afterwards.

Thanks,

HM